

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-15, 17-22, and 25-37 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

1. Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Epstein et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,264,336). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 has been cancelled and claim 17 has been amended to depend from claim 1. As claim 1 is not anticipated by Epstein, claim 17 should also not be anticipated. This rejection, therefore, should be rendered moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

1. Claims 1, 4 – 5, 15, 20, 22, 29, 30, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,509,942) in view of Fukuyoshi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,483,562). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention called for in independent claims 1, 20, 22, and 35 is directed to a liquid crystal device wherein a protective film is formed over the entire length of the reflective film composed of a silver alloy or the like (Figure 2). Due to the protective film, crystal grain growth of the reflective film is suppressed even if a high temperature treatment of the alignment film is employed after the formation of the reflective film. As a result of the crystal grain growth of the reflective being suppressed,

to the first lead, a decrease in reflectance is not a problem to be concerned with. As such, the resistance of the lead can be reduced by growing crystal grains or by including large crystal grains. Neither Tanaka, Fukuyoshi, nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests the features achieved by the claimed invention. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that newly amended claims 1, 20, 22, and 35 are not obvious and in condition for allowance. Moreover, claims 4-5, 15, 29, and 30 which are dependent on independent claim 1 should also not be obvious for at least the same reasons.

2. Claims 6-14 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al and Fukuyoshi as applied above, further in view of Nemoto et al (USPN 6,456,344). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6-14 and 21 are dependent on claims 1 and 20, respectively, and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as their independent base claims addressed above.

3. Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein as applied to claims 16 and 17, in view of Satake et al (USPN 6,426,787). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 17, which has been amended to depend on claim 1. Claim 18, therefore, should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1, addressed above.

4. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 24 has been cancelled and claim 25 has been amended to depend from claim 22, addressed above. Claim 25 is not obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 1, addressed above.

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Epstein et al as applied to claims 24 and 25, in view of Satake. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 26 is dependent on claim 25, which is dependent on claim 22, addressed above. Claim 26 should not be obvious for at least the same reasons.

6. Claims 27, 33, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsute et al (USPN 6,172,726). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that Matsute has two metal/reflective films of silver. However, upon review of Matsute, it can be seen in Figure 3 that the metal layer 73 and electrodes 65 are the same layer. This contrasts with the claimed invention in that claims 27, 33, and 36 call for a reflective film formed on a substrate as well as a first lead formed on the substrate. These two elements, however, are separate and distinct from each other. That is, the reflective film and the first lead are not constituted in a single layer. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsute does not render the claimed invention obvious.

7. Claims 28, 34, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsute et al in view of Epstein et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that Matsute does not appear to specify a film having different resistances, but Epstein teaches laminates of silver alloy films. Because these films have different metal alloys, they have different resistances, and therefore, the above claims are obvious. Applicants respectfully assert, however, that neither Matsute, Epstein, nor any combination thereof contains any teaching or suggestion that a resistance may be varied. As neither Matsute nor Epstein teaches, suggests, or provides motivation to utilize such a feature, the claimed invention is not obvious. Further, as stated above, Matsute teaches that the metal layer 73 and electrodes 65 are the same layer which contrasts with the claimed invention. As such, Applicants further assert that the proposed combination of Matsute and Epstein does not yield the claimed invention and, therefore, the claimed invention is not obvious.

8. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al and Fukuyoshi et al in view of Matsute et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 31 is dependent on claim 1, addressed above, and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

9. Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al, Fukuyoshi et al, and Matsute et al in view of Epstein. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 32 is dependent on claim 1, addressed above, and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner has indicated that claim 19 is allowed. Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the allowance of claim 19.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 27, 2003

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
GGS/BEW/JAH

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344